

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the office action dated February 12, 2004. This response is believed to address all grounds for rejection stated in the office action.

Assignment of the Case to a Customer Number

Please assign this case to customer number 24490. Additionally please change the correspondence address to the address associated with that customer number.

Amendment to Claim 2

Claim 2 is amended to add the language "by different receiving parties" to overcome the suggestion in the office action at page 4, second paragraph, that the feature was not recited in the claim to patentably distinguish over Fortenberry. As amended, the step in claim 2 now recites, in part, as follows.

step for associating with each information object at least one of a plurality of security clearance levels, thereby enabling access to individually selected portions of the user's personal information by different receiving parties;

This amendment does not add any new matter and the Examiner is respectfully requested to review and enter the amendment. Further, Applicants note that they amend the claim at this time to achieve an early allowance and not as a concession that Fortenberry applies in the manner described in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants reserve the right to prosecute the unamended claim at a later date. But in view that the amendment overcomes the objection in the Office Action, Examiner is respectfully requested to allow the claim as amended.

Rejection of claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gebauer (USP 6,662,343 B1). This response traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the office action dated February 12, 2004. This response is believed to address all grounds for rejection stated in the office action.

Assignment of the Case to a Customer Number

Please assign this case to customer number 24490. Additionally please change the correspondence address to the address associated with that customer number.

Amendment to Claim 2

Claim 2 is amended to add the language "by different receiving parties" to overcome the suggestion in the office action at page 4, second paragraph, that the feature was not recited in the claim to patentably distinguish over Fortenberry. As amended, the step in claim 2 now recites, in part, as follows.

step for associating with each information object at least one of a plurality of security clearance levels, thereby enabling access to individually selected portions of the user's personal information by different receiving parties;

This amendment does not add any new matter and the Examiner is respectfully requested to review and enter the amendment. Further, Applicants note that they amend the claim at this time to achieve an early allowance and not as a concession that Fortenberry applies in the manner described in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants reserve the right to prosecute the unamended claim at a later date. But in view that the amendment overcomes the objection in the Office Action, Examiner is respectfully requested to allow the claim as amended.

Rejection of claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gebauer (USP 6,662,343 B1). This response traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

As to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Gebauer does not disclose anywhere the steps of:

- (a) "dragging and dropping the item of interest into the storage area" and
- (b) "assigning at least one of a plurality of security levels at any granularity to the item of interest"

The Office Action states that step (a) excerpted above, that is, the dragging and dropping step, is disclosed in Gebauer at col. 12, lines 63-67 and col. 13, lines 1-2; fig 9, items 242, 244, and 248; and col. 10, lines 9-13 and 28-29; fig. 6, items 120 and 128. But it is respectfully submitted that the cited portions do not state what the office action implies. For the sake of clarity, the cited portions of text from Gebauer are reproduced here:

Browser 244 is a standard, commercially available web browser having frames capability. Path 248 is the normal world wide web path between work station 242 and web server 254 for the transfer of service requests and input data. These transfers are converted by Cool ICE gateway 256 as explained above and sent to Cool ICE service handler 258 via path 266 for disposition.

[See col. 12, lines 62-67 and col. 13, lines 1-2]

FIG. 6 is a schematic diagram 116 showing the processing of a service request by the Cool ICE system. Screen 118 is the view as seen by the client or user at an internet terminal (see also FIG. 4). This screen is produced by the commercially available browser 120 selected by the user.

...

Window area 128 provides for the entry of any necessary or helpful input parameters.

[See col. 10, lines 9-13 and 28-29]

It is respectfully submitted that this language does not comport with the characterization given in the Office Action. Importantly, nowhere in Gebauer can one find the string "drag". The fact that a window is used to input data entry is not the same as stating that a data object can be dragged and dropped into a window. The concept of "Drag and Drop" has its origins in the graphical user interfaces, and dates back to the X-Window system, and is not the same as

using a window to enter data into a text box or other object. Gebauer is not related to the instant claims because it does not disclose or suggest or motivate one to use dragging and dropping from one web site or other location on the Internet to another location on the Internet items of interest in an effort to create an online public library, that can provide selective access to portions of the data thus added to the library. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider.

As to (b) excerpted above, Gebauer does not disclose that step either. The Office Action states that Gebauer disclosed at col. 6, lines 30-35; fig. 2, items 30 and 34 described the idea of "number of sublevels corresponding to the various levels of authority of the various employees". See Office Action at page 7. That part of Gebauer is reproduced below.

Service C 40 is potentially the highest level of classification. It contains data and functions which can be made available only to employees. In actual practice, this might entail a number of sub levels corresponding to the various levels of authority of the various employees.

[See col. 6, lines 30-35]

Applicants respectfully disagree with this characterization. Gebauer classifies services and persons. Assigning at least one of a plurality of security levels to each item of interest at any granularity means a security level is assigned to the item, and not to a person accessing the data. Gebauer describes the latter and the instant application claims the former. Gebauer contemplates a number of levels of authority for the various employees, and not assigning a security level to each item of interest. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As to claim 3, the same arguments presented in response to the rejection of claim 1 are incorporated by reference. Because both claims are believed to be patentable, and because claim 2 is amended without prejudice to satisfy the Examiner's remark based on *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F. 2d 1181, 26 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993), Applicants believe that all rejections are properly overcome and

the application is in a condition for allowance. Applicants believe that the amendment to claim 2 would not be necessary because Fortenberry does not contemplate or disclose assigning at least one of a plurality of security levels to each data item in order to facilitate individually selected portions of data items to different requesting parties. Notwithstanding this belief, Applicants amend the claim to achieve an early allowance. A notice of allowance is respectfully solicited.

Conclusion

This response addresses all grounds for rejection of claims in the Office Action. In view of the aforementioned arguments, applicant believes that all currently pending claims in the instant are patentable over the cited art. A Petition for extension of time for one month and a fee of \$55 for the extension are also enclosed. Reconsideration is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



(44,602)

Naren Chaganti
432 S. Curson Ave, Ste. 12 H
Los Angeles, CA 90036
(650) 248-7011 phone
naren@chaganti.com E-mail

Applicant

Certificate of Mailing

I certify that this paper is mailed to the USPTO on the date indicated below.

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

June 14, 2004
Date



NAREN CHAGANTI